## FARNAN

## February 28, 2013

## VIA E-Filing

The Honorable Richard G. Andrews
United States District Court for the District of Delaware
J. Caleb Boggs Federal Building
844 N. King Street
Room 2325
Unit 9
Wilmington, DE 19801-3568

RE: Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. 3M Company,

C.A. No. 12-1533-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc.,

CA. No. 12-1534-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. AT&T Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1536-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Brother International Corp.,

C.A. No. 12-1538-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Ceridian Corp.,

C.A. No. 12-1541-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Crocs Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1542-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Lands' End Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1547-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Oriental Trading Company Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1553-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Rite Aid Corporation,

C.A. No. 12-1555-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Sprint Spectrum LP,

C.A. No. 12-1556-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Thomson Reuters US Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1557-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Bosch Security Systems Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1650-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Dish Network Corp.,

C.A. No. 12-1651-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Elavon Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1652-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. EMC Corp.,

C.A. No. 12-1653-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. goEmerchant LLC,

C.A. No. 12-1654-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Mediacom Communications Corp.,

C.A. No. 12-1656-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Staples Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1660-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1661-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Reed Elsevier US Holdings Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1684-RGA

Pragmatus Telecom LLC v. Seagate Technology (US) Holdings Inc.,

C.A. No. 12-1686-RGA

## Dear Judge Andrews:

Plaintiff writes in response to Your Honor's Oral Order dated February 28, 2013, requesting the parties' position regarding whether the Motions to Dismiss filed by Defendants in the above-captioned cases are moot in light of the filing of Plaintiff's Amended Complaints. Plaintiff maintains that the filing of the Amended Complaints has mooted Defendants' Motions to Dismiss. Plaintiff's position is supported by numerous decisions from this District. *Owens v. Connections Community Support Programs, Inc.*, 840 F. Supp. 2d 791, 794 (D. Del. 2012) (Robinson, J.) ("Defendants' motion to dismiss became moot upon the filing of the amended complaint."); *see also Daughtry v. Family Dollar Stores, Inc.*, 634 F. Supp. 2d 475, 477 n.1 (D. Del. 2009) (Robinson, J.) ("The allegations contained in plaintiffs' amended complaint now make defendant's previous motion to dismiss [] moot."); *Airport Investors Ltd. P'Ship, Inc. v. Neatrour*, 2004 WL 225060, at \*1 (D. Del. Feb. 3, 2004) (Sleet, J.) ("Because [plaintiff] subsequently filed an amended complaint as a matter of right, the court finds the [defendant's] motion to dismiss the initial complaint moot.").

Should Your Honor have any questions, we are available at your convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian E. Farnan

Brian E. Farnan (Bar No. 4089)